

REMARKS

The Examiner's antecedent objection on page 2 of the September 26 Office Action has been noted and attended to by revision to page 5 of the specification submitted herewith. The oversight is regretted.

With respect to the 35 U.S.C. 112 claim rejections we respond that the language "visible surface" has been appropriately added to claim 21 which is the base claim for claim 6. Further, the "exterior viewable surface" phrase which appeared in original claim 8 has been appropriately included in claim 22 which corresponds to claim 8. With respect to the Examiner's comment directed to the phrase "the rear" in line 7 of claim 1 we have to report that applicant's copy of originally submitted claim 1 does not contain this phrase. It is of course possible that our file is in error and that a later, filed version contains the phrase. May we suggest that the most expeditious way of responding to the Examiner's objection would be for her to telephone the undersigned at the below listed number and a supplemental paper will be immediately filed to respond to the objection.

With respect to the rejection on Eickhof we point out that new claim 21 which is based on original claim 1 is neither taught nor remotely suggested by Eickhof. From a glance at Figures 1 and 2 of Eickhof it will be seen that it is essential that the upper and lower shutters 16 and 18 must be spaced apart at

least the width of Eickhof's wrench 50 in order for the Eickhof system to be operable; in other words Eickhof's system cannot function, nor does it teach or suggest a way to function, unless the shutters are spaced apart so as to have access to his fastening apparatus 10. The result is a highly unsightly, eye-jarring series of vertical (see Figure 1) and horizontal spaces which are at odds with the quiet dignity of the wall surface formed by the shutters of applicant's columbarium. Specifically, in applicant's system his facing objects 10, roughly analogous to Eickhof's shutters, may be butted against one another to present a smooth, easy on the eye uninterrupted surface consonant with the feeling of repose which a columbarium is intended to project. The root cause of course is Eickhof's cumbersome and highly complicated arrangement of up and down moving "pistons" or studs 36 which requires anchorage on two adjacent shutters and simultaneous access to two shutters to assemble or disassemble, this contrasts to applicant's simple in and out member 22 which can be located in the center, if desired, of his facing object 10 as shown in applicant's Figure 1. In view of the inapplicability of Eickhof to claims 1-4 as now presented withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4 on Eickhof is in order and is requested.

In response to the Examiner's designation of claims 5-14 as allowable if rewritten, we have attended to the Examiner's comments and hence claims 21 (corresponding to claims 1 and 5) and claims 6 and 7 are now fully allowable.

Likewise, claims 22 (corresponding to claims 1 and 8) and claims 9-14 are now fully allowable.

Although we recognize the Examiner's ruling of withdrawal of claims 15 and 16 we point out that none of the many references cited to date, including those cited in the first Office Action which was an action on the merits of claims 15 and 16, showed the claimed subject matter for attaching an object of stone to a supporting structure. A reconsideration by the Examiner of this aspect of the ruling would be welcome to the end that applicant would be spared the expense and time of a further application.

With respect to the rejection on Iesaka et al we point out that new claim 23, which is based on original claim 17, is neither taught nor remotely suggested by Iesaka. From a glance at Iesaka it will be seen that Iesaka's "decorative sheet 2" plays no role in the fixing of the sheet to a support structure other than providing a countersink for the flanged head 7 of screw 6. In other words, all fixing of the parts with respect to one another takes place beyond decorative sheet 2, the screw 6 functioning merely as a peg or projection from which to hang sheet 2. In applicant's system by contrast his

faceplate 10 with its specifically contoured cavity 24 (i.e.: having a diameter slightly greater than the diameter of flat end 26 of head 41 plus double the thickness of the wall of tubing 32) forms an integral part of the fastening means by making possible the use of non-destructive wedging pressure to assemble and disassemble the faceplate 10 from its support structure. This is a much faster and more efficient mechanical system for accomplishing the purpose of the invention using far fewer, and off the shelf, parts as contrast to Eickhof's larger number and harder to install parts of his Figures 1, 3 and 4, or special weldments of nuts 22 of Figure 5, etc.

In view of the foregoing we believe the application is now ready for unconditional allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.